UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/566,775	08/09/2006	Espen Ommundsen	0002707USU	7617	
	27623 7590 03/04/2009 OHLANDT, GREELEY, RUGGIERO & PERLE, LLP			EXAMINER	
ONE LANDMARK SQUARE, 10TH FLOOR			NUTTER, NATHAN M		
STAMFORD, CT 06901			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1796		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/04/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Commons	10/566,775	OMMUNDSEN ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Nathan M. Nutter	1796			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
	-· action is non-final.				
<i>i</i> —	/ 				
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
Disposition of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1-31-06.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. the recitation of "about 0.6" is a new limitation since the Specification teaches a lower limit of 0.6 at page 5, 3rd full paragraph.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Parikh et al (WO 92/07905).

The reference to Parikh et al teaches the use of a high density polyethylene of density at least 950 kg/m³ in amounts "as low as about 0.01 percent by weight of the total blend" and includes the range recited as a nucleating agent for a polyethylene resin that may comprise other monomers and having a density of less than 940 kg/m³.

page 6 (line 19) to page 8 (line 29) and page 9 (lines 3-34). The films obtained with this composition have haze of less than 40% and a gloss of greater than 35. Note claims 1-11 and Table VII. Dependent claim 7 is a product by process claim. Process steps in process-by-process claims are not deemed to be claim limitations.

Claims 1-4 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gurevitch et al (US 5,082,902).

Note column 1 (lines 44-62) for the relative densities of the polyethylene resins employed. When polymer (a) has a density of 0.94 g/cm³, the second polymer (designated first polyethylene, herein) will have a density of .955 g/cm³ or more. Note column 2 (lines 43 et seq.). The copolymers of claim 8 are shown at column 3 (lines 8-30).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hwo et al (US 4,359,544)

The reference to Hwo et al teaches the use of a higher density polyethylene resin to nucleate a lower density polyethylene (co)polymer. Note the Abstract. Note column 2

(lines 18-27) for the process and the compositional limitations. The high density polyethylene is taught to have a density "preferably at least about .95 g/cc" and have a "melt index of from about 0.1 to 20," at column 3 (lines 15-39). Further, note the use of an ethylene copolymer at the table in column 4. The manufacture of a film is shown at the paragraph bridging column 2 to column 3.

While the reference does not specifically teach the density of the copolymer to be nucleated, it remains clear logic that if one is going to crystallize a polymer by nucleation, that polymer would be less crystalline and, hence, possess a lower density. The recitations of the characteristics of the film of claim 12 would be expected from the reference teachings since there is nothing recited in the claims to indicate otherwise. Once a reference teaching a product appearing to be substantially identical is made the basis of a rejection and the examiner presents evidence or reasoning tending to show inherency, the burden shifts to the applicant to show an unobvious difference. In re Fitzgerald, 619 F.2d 67, 70, 205 USPQ 594, 596 (CCPA 1980). In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433-34 (CCPA 1977). In re Schreiber, 128 F.3d 1473, 1478, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1432 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan M. Nutter whose telephone number is 571-272-1076. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 a.m.-6:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James J. Seidleck can be reached on 571-272-1078. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 10/566,775 Page 5

Art Unit: 1796

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nathan M. Nutter/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796

nmn

2 March 2009